



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,012	12/30/2003	Gregor K. Frey	6570P032	6461
45062	7590	11/01/2007		
SAP/BLAKELY 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER HO, ANDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/01/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,012

Applicant(s)

FREY ET AL.

Examiner

Andy Ho

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/20/2007.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the application filed 12/30/2003.
2. Claims 1-34 have been examined and are pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Edwards U.S Patent No. 6,539,501.

**As to claim 1**, Edwards teaches a method of providing filtered unified logging, the method comprising:

receiving a message (outputting a message to a file, lines 29-36 column 3), the message having a predefined severity;

dropping the message if the message severity does not reach a threshold severity (severity level and outputting a message to a file, lines 29-36 column 3);

applying one or more filters to the message if the message severity reaches the threshold severity (methods and variables applying to generated data, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5); and

sending the message to a destination if the message is not filtered out (file for outputting messages, lines 34-36 column 3).

**As to claim 2**, Edwards further teaches the message severity and the threshold severity have a severity selected from a group comprising debug, path, info, warning, error, fatal, and none (error messages, warning or information when executing code, lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 3**, Edwards further teaches comparing the message severity with the threshold severity (the use of severity level, lines 29-36 column 3).

**As to claim 4**, Edwards further teaches the severity information is inherited (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 5**, Edwards further teaches the inherited severity is restricted (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 6**, Edwards further teaches as long as the message passes a severity and filter evaluation of a child object, the message is published (methods and variables applying to generated data, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5).

**As to claim 7**, Edwards further teaches the publication is via an inherited log (log file, lines 34-36 column 3).

**As to claim 8**, Edwards further teaches the method is implemented utilizing Java (Java coding, lines 47-59 column 2).

**As to claim 9**, Edwards further teaches the message is sent by an application (a program, lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 10**, Edwards further teaches message is selected from a list comprising a log message and a trace message (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 11**, Edwards teaches a filtered unified logging system (Fig. 1), comprising:

one or more log controllers to represent source data (logger daemon 12, Fig. 1), each of the log controllers receiving one or more messages (a message, lines 29-36 column 3);

one or more filters coupled to the log controllers to filter the received messages (methods and variables applying to generated data, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5);

one or more logs to represent one or more corresponding destinations for the received messages (outputting messages to log file, lines 29-36 column 3); and

one or more filters coupled to the logs to filter the messages prior to publication by the logs (methods and variables applying to generated data, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5).

**As to claim 12**, Edwards further teaches wherein the system is part of Java 2 Enterprise Edition engine (Java coding, lines 47-59 column 2).

**As to claim 13**, Edwards further teaches a formatter coupled to each of the logs to determine a format of the received message prior to publication (outputting error messages, warning or information, lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 14**, Edwards further teaches the formatter includes subclasses or modules comprising a trace formatter (methods and variables applying to generated data, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5).

**As to claim 15**, Edwards further teaches the log controllers includes one or more subclasses or modules selected from a group comprising a category and a location (groupNumbers, getTraceGroup...line 65 column 3 to line 20 column 4).

**As to claim 16**, Edwards further teaches each of the logs include one or more subclasses or modules selected from a group comprising a stream log, a file log, and a console log (log file, lines 31-36 column 3).

**As to claim 17**, Edwards further teaches one or more of the file log and console log are subclasses of the stream log (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 18**, Edwards further teaches wherein the source is an application (a program, lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 19**, Edwards further teaches the message includes severity information corresponding to that message (the use of severity level, lines 29-36 column 3).

**As to claim 20**, Edwards further teaches the severity information includes at least one severity selected from a list comprising debug, path, info, warning, error, fatal, and none (error messages, warning or information when executing code, lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 21**, Edwards further teaches the severity information is inherited (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 22**, Edwards further teaches the inherited severity is restricted (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 23**, Edwards further teaches the system provides filtered unified logging for both tracing and logging (lines 16-36 column 3).

**As to claim 24**, Edwards further teaches the system is implemented using Java (Java coding, lines 47-59 column 2).

**As to claims 25-34**, they are computer program product claims of claims 1-10, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-10 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Edwards reference does not teach the limitations of claim 1 (Remarks, last complete paragraph page 7 to first incomplete paragraph page 8). More specifically, the applicant argued that lines 29-36 column 3 in Edwards reference does not teach the limitations of claim 1. In response, lines 29-36 column 3 in Edwards reference was not the only cited portion in the rejection of claim 1. The applicant did not argued how the other cited portion in Edwards reference, line 48 column 3 to line 54 column 5, did not met the claim limitations of claim 1.

The applicant indicated that claim 11 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 (Remarks, last complete paragraph page 8 continue to first incomplete paragraph page 9). In response, claim 11 does not have similar limitations as in claim 1.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or' Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should



Art Unit: 2194

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents


P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 - 3762

A.H  
October 26, 2007

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER